

EXHIBIT H

DEFENDANTS' AFFIRMATIVE DEPOSITION DESIGNATIONS FOR JUNE HOWARD					
DEPO DATE	DESIGNATION TYPE	DEFENDANTS' AFFIRMATIVE DESIGNATIONS			
		Begin Page at	Begin Line at	End Page at	End Line at
4/25/2019	All Def Affirm	12	18	12	20
4/25/2019	All Def Affirm	13	23	13	25
4/25/2019	All Def Affirm	14	1	14	10
4/25/2019	All Def Affirm	15	11	15	19
4/25/2019	All Def Affirm	15	23	15	23
4/25/2019	McKesson Affirm	15	25	16	18
4/25/2019	McKesson Affirm	16	19	16	25
4/25/2019	McKesson Affirm	17	5	17	15
4/25/2019	All Def Affirm	17	24	18	3
4/25/2019	All Def Affirm	18	4	18	8
4/25/2019	McKesson Affirm	18	15	18	20
4/25/2019	All Def Affirm	18	21	20	3
4/25/2019	McKesson Affirm	20	4	20	5
4/25/2019	McKesson Affirm	20	9	20	20
4/25/2019	McKesson Affirm	20	22	20	24
4/25/2019	McKesson Affirm	21	3	21	4
4/25/2019	McKesson Affirm	21	6	21	6
4/25/2019	McKesson Affirm	21	16	21	22
4/25/2019	All Def Affirm	22	12	22	21
4/25/2019	All Def Affirm	24	3	24	8
4/25/2019	All Def Affirm	25	5	26	2
4/25/2019	All Def Affirm	26	5	26	5
4/25/2019	All Def Affirm	28	17	29	1
4/25/2019	All Def Affirm	29	19	30	1
4/25/2019	All Def Affirm	30	6	30	6
4/25/2019	All Def Affirm	30	8	30	11
4/25/2019	All Def Affirm	30	14	30	18
4/25/2019	All Def Affirm	30	22	31	6
4/25/2019	All Def Affirm	31	10	31	14
4/25/2019	All Def Affirm	31	16	31	16
4/25/2019	All Def Affirm	34	6	34	12
4/25/2019	All Def Affirm	34	15	34	15
4/25/2019	McKesson Affirm	34	25	35	5
4/25/2019	McKesson Affirm	40	18	40	25
4/25/2019	McKesson Affirm	41	3	41	12
4/25/2019	All Def Affirm	41	14	41	16
4/25/2019	All Def Affirm	41	21	41	21
4/25/2019	All Def Affirm	41	23	42	1
4/25/2019	All Def Affirm	42	6	42	6
4/25/2019	All Def Affirm	42	8	42	11
4/25/2019	All Def Affirm	42	15	42	15
4/25/2019	All Def Affirm	42	17	42	19
4/25/2019	All Def Affirm	42	23	42	23
4/25/2019	All Def Affirm	42	25	42	25
4/25/2019	All Def Affirm	43	4	43	9
4/25/2019	All Def Affirm	43	11	43	19
4/25/2019	All Def Affirm	43	24	43	24
4/25/2019	McKesson Affirm	44	2	44	5
4/25/2019	All Def Affirm	44	23	44	25
4/25/2019	All Def Affirm	45	4	45	4
4/25/2019	All Def Affirm	45	6	45	13
4/25/2019	All Def Affirm	47	2	48	5
4/25/2019	All Def Affirm	48	8	48	8

DEFENDANTS' AFFIRMATIVE DEPOSITION DESIGNATIONS FOR JUNE HOWARD					
DEPO DATE	DESIGNATION TYPE	DEFENDANTS' AFFIRMATIVE DESIGNATIONS			
		Begin Page at	Begin Line at	End Page at	End Line at
4/25/2019	All Def Affirm	49	2	49	5
4/25/2019	All Def Affirm	49	8	49	9
4/25/2019	McKesson Affirm	50	12	50	16
4/25/2019	McKesson Affirm	50	19	50	21
4/25/2019	All Def Affirm	54	7	54	19
4/25/2019	All Def Affirm	54	22	55	22
4/25/2019	All Def Affirm	56	2	56	4
4/25/2019	All Def Affirm	56	6	57	3
4/25/2019	All Def Affirm	57	8	57	12
4/25/2019	All Def Affirm	57	14	57	22
4/25/2019	All Def Affirm	58	1	58	7

PLAINTIFFS' OBJECTIONS & DEFENDANTS' RESPONSES FOR					
DEPO DATE	PLAINTIFFS' OBJECTIONS				DEFENDANTS' RESPONSES
	Begin Page at	Begin Line at	End Page at	End Line at	PLAINTIFFS' OBJECTIONS
4/25/2019	12	18	12	18	Plaintiffs object to the extent that certain Defendant deposition designations of the DEA depositions and certain 30(b)(6) depositions are duplicative of one another. Plaintiffs further object to any testimony by current or former DEA agents designated by the Defendants to the extent that such testimony seeks to define what the law requires or whether Defendants' conduct violated or did not violate the law, as such testimony would invade the province of the jury.
4/25/2019	15	11	15	23	Calls for legal conclusion, speculative, relevance, vague, scope, foundation
4/25/2019	20	4	20	12	Speculative, relevance, vague, scope, foundation
4/25/2019	20	19	21	4	Speculative, relevance, vague, scope, foundation
4/25/2019	25	25	26	5	Speculative, relevance, vague, scope, foundation
4/25/2019	29	23	31	16	Speculative, relevance, vague, scope, foundation
4/25/2019	34	6	34	15	Speculative, relevance, vague, scope, foundation
4/25/2019	40	18	43	24	Speculative, relevance, vague, scope, foundation
4/25/2019	44	4	44	23	Speculative, relevance, vague, scope, foundation
4/25/2019	47	2	47	13	Speculative, relevance, vague, scope, foundation
4/25/2019	48	4	48	8	Relevance, speculative, witness has no knowledge
					<p>Testimony is not duplicative or cumulative of other designations from Ms. Howard's testimony. Nor is Ms. Howard's testimony duplicative or cumulative of any other DEA witness. Her specific career path – chief of the reports analyst unit and a part of the DEA for over twenty years – gives her a different perspective on the central issues of this case than the other DEA fact witnesses. In addition, to the extent multiple DEA witnesses testified along similar lines on the issues central to this case, that is relevant to show that those witnesses shared a common understanding of DEA's interpretation and enforcement of the suspicious order monitoring regulation, rather than an outlier view, which is, in turn, relevant to defendants' scienter. This general objection is improper. To the extent plaintiffs' object to specific questions and answers that may elicit testimony about what the law requires, they should so state individually, on a question-by-question basis, so defendants may respond based on the context of the question and answer provided.</p> <p>Not speculative; witness was testifying based on her personal knowledge of what she was authorized to testify about. Relevant to plaintiffs' claims and defendants' defenses, including defendants' compliance with DEA regulations. Question/answer are not vague, they are clear and direct. Question is within scope of Touhy authorization and does not call for a legal conclusion. Foundation has been laid based on witness' knowledge, experience, and the testimony that proceeds this section.</p> <p>Not speculative; witness was testifying based on her personal knowledge and experience as the chief of the reports analyst unit. Relevant to plaintiffs' claims and defendants' defenses, including defendants' compliance with DEA regulations. Question/answer are not vague, they are clear and direct. Question is within scope of Touhy authorization. Foundation has been laid based on witness' knowledge, experience, and the testimony that proceeds this section.</p> <p>Withdrawn.</p> <p>Not speculative; witness was testifying based on her personal knowledge and experience. Relevant to plaintiffs' claims and defendants' defenses, including defendants' compliance with DEA regulations. Question/answer are not vague, they are clear and direct. Question is within scope of Touhy authorization. Foundation has been laid based on witness' knowledge, experience, and the testimony that proceeds this section.</p> <p>Plaintiffs' objection is improper, to extent plaintiffs object to specific questions in this section, they should state their objections, on a question-by-question basis, so defendants may respond based on the context of the question and answer provided. Not speculative; witness was testifying based on her personal knowledge and experience. Relevant to plaintiffs' claims and defendants' defenses, including defendants' compliance with DEA regulations. Question/answer are not vague, they are clear and direct. Question is within scope of Touhy authorization. Foundation has been laid based on witness' knowledge, experience, and the testimony that proceeds this section.</p> <p>Not speculative; witness was testifying based on her personal knowledge and experience. Relevant to plaintiffs' claims and defendants' defenses, including defendants' compliance with DEA regulations. Question/answer are not vague, they are clear and direct. Question is within scope of Touhy authorization. Foundation has been laid based on witness' knowledge, experience, and the testimony that proceeds this section.</p> <p>Plaintiffs' objection is improper, to extent plaintiffs object to specific questions in this section, they should state their objections, on a question-by-question basis, so defendants may respond based on the context of the question and answer provided. Not speculative; witness was testifying based on her personal knowledge and experience. Relevant to plaintiffs' claims and defendants' defenses, including defendants' compliance with DEA regulations. Question/answer are not vague, they are clear and direct. Question is within scope of Touhy authorization. Foundation has been laid based on witness' knowledge, experience, and the testimony that proceeds this section.</p> <p>Not speculative; witness was testifying based on her personal knowledge and experience. Relevant to plaintiffs' claims and defendants' defenses, including defendants' compliance with DEA regulations. Question/answer are not vague, they are clear and direct. Question is within scope of Touhy authorization. Foundation has been laid based on witness' knowledge, experience, and the testimony that proceeds this section.</p> <p>Objections improper because not lodged at time of deposition. Not speculative; witness was testifying based on her personal knowledge and experience. Relevant to plaintiffs' claims and defendants' defenses, including defendants' compliance with DEA regulations. Question/answer are not vague, they are clear and direct. Question is within scope of Touhy authorization. Foundation has been laid based on witness' knowledge, experience, and the testimony that proceeds this section.</p> <p>Not argumentative; question was what the basis for alleged lawsuits against the DEA were. Not speculative; witness was testifying based on her personal knowledge and experience. Relevant to plaintiffs' claims and defendants' defenses, including defendants' compliance with DEA regulations. Question/answer are not vague, they are clear and direct. Question is within scope of Touhy authorization. Foundation has been laid based on witness' knowledge, experience, and the testimony that proceeds this section.</p>

PLAINTIFFS' OBJECTIONS & DEFENDANTS' RESPONSES FOR						
DEPO DATE	PLAINTIFFS' OBJECTIONS				DEFENDANTS' RESPONSES	
	Begin Page at	Begin Line at	End Page at	End Line at	PLAINTIFFS' OBJECTIONS	DEFENDANTS' RESPONSES
4/25/2019	49	2	49	9	Argumentative, speculative, relevance, vague, scope, foundation	Not argumentative; question was asking what role purported threat of litigation had on DEA actions. Not speculative; witness was testifying based on her personal knowledge and experience. Relevant to plaintiffs' claims and defendants' defenses, including defendants' compliance with DEA regulations. Question/answer are not vague, they are clear and direct. Question is within scope of Touhy authorization. Foundation has been laid based on witness' knowledge, experience, and the testimony that proceeds this section.
4/25/2019	50	12	50	21	Mischaracterizes prior testimony, relevance, speculative	Plaintiff previously testified that the threat of litigation contributed to the DEA ceasing to send such letters. Not speculative; witness was testifying based on her personal knowledge and experience. Relevant to plaintiffs' claims and defendants' defenses, including defendants' compliance with DEA regulations.
4/25/2019	54	17	55	22	Scope, relevance, lawyer colloquy	Plaintiffs' objection is improper, to extent plaintiffs object to specific questions in this section, they should state their objections, on a question-by-question basis, so defendants may respond based on the context of the question and answer provided. Relevant to plaintiffs' claims and defendants' defenses, including defendants' compliance with DEA regulations. Question is within scope of Touhy authorization.
4/25/2019	56	2	56	8	Relevance, vague, scope	Relevant to plaintiffs' claims and defendants' defenses, including defendants' compliance with DEA regulations. Question/answer are not vague, they are clear and direct. Question is within scope of Touhy authorization.
4/25/2019	56	23	57	12	Relevance, scope, calls for legal conclusion	Relevant to plaintiffs' claims and defendants' defenses, including defendants' compliance with DEA regulations. Question is within scope of Touhy authorization and does not call for a legal conclusion as it does not ask for an interpretation of the law.
4/25/2019	57	21	58	7	Scope, relevance, vague	Relevant to plaintiffs' claims and defendants' defenses, including defendants' compliance with DEA regulations. Question/answer are not vague, they are clear and direct. Question is within scope of Touhy authorization.